

Do you mean to tell me that the very people who benefit, who raise our prices on energy or on pharmaceuticals are writing the laws and Congress is doing nothing?

And the sad truth is we are doing worse than nothing. We are enabling this.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, we do not want to believe that the U.S. Congress would allow such a massive rip-off of Americans to take place and not do something. We do not want to believe that just because Ken Lay was so close to President Bush that the whole Federal Government will do nothing. We do not want to believe that massive political contributions could end up with the Federal Government not doing its job. We do not want to believe that when the Federal Government itself concludes that there was a crime, that there was manipulation, that there was gamesmanship, that there was defrauding, that there was embezzling, that they would do nothing. We do not believe that is the right thing to do, and we think ultimately we have some confidence that we will actually prevail on this. Even if it takes November and we get a new Congress that will finally take action to get a refund for Americans, that is the route we will go.

I want to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) for joining me this evening.

THE WAR ON TERROR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to be here tonight. I am especially gratified at the presence of the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. I truly believe that there is not a finer American in the Congress than the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. Speaker, as we begin to discuss some of the new events that are taking place in Iraq, I thought it might be good to review some of the circumstances that brought us there in the first place. Mr. Speaker, with all of the discussion lately regarding the search for weapons of mass destruction, regarding the Abu Ghraib prison issue, sometimes I think we forget what our basic reason was for going into Iraq.

After September 11, this country recognized that it had entered into a different age, and the wars that we fought in the past and the Cold War we had an enemy that we recognized for who they were. We recognized that they had a capability that was incredibly dangerous to the freedom of the United States of America. We knew their capability, Mr. Speaker; but we did not al-

ways know their intentions. And, Mr. Speaker, I submit that even the basis of our defense at the time in the Cold War was predicated to a great degree on our enemies' sanity. We believed that they had enough respect for their own lives and enough commitment to live that somehow our own offensive capability would deter an attack from an enemy like the Soviet Union.

And, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we would all like to have a better philosophy than mutually assured destruction, but indeed that philosophy kept us safe for a very long time. But, again, it was predicated on the sanity of our enemy.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we recognize a different enemy. It is an asymmetric enemy that no longer fits the traditional mode at all. We now know the intention of our enemy very well. If September 11 did not teach us that, then I suppose it is a lesson that will escape us forever. If the circumstances regarding the brutal murder of Nick Berg does not teach us the mindset and intention of our enemy, then again I suppose that lesson will evade us. If the words of Osama bin Laden when he said that "obtaining nuclear weapons is our religious duty," if that does not help us understand the gravity of the enemy we face, then perhaps again it is a lesson that will evade us to our great peril.

Mr. Speaker, today with terrorism we face an enemy that has the worst possible intentions for America and the worst possible intentions for freedom. It is fundamentally critical that we interdict their capability. And, Mr. Speaker, of all the reasons for us to have gone into Iraq to free that country, one of the greatest is to interdict the entire process that leads to the terrorist organizations throughout the world.

Terrorists understand that better than anyone. Even now terrorists come into Iraq on a regular basis to try to not only discourage Americans from maintaining their commitment to freedom but to do everything that they can to win the battle there in Iraq because they know that if there is a beachhead of freedom built in Iraq, if we truly can find freedom come to this nation, that it could begin to spread throughout the entire Middle East region, and, Mr. Speaker, perhaps it has the ability to turn the whole of humanity in a better direction.

□ 1915

I truly believe that our choices are very simple: We either defeat terrorists in Iraq on their own ground, or we continue to fight them here.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important that we not only defeat terrorists on the battlefield, but we have to understand that we need to address the core rationale that spawned terrorism in the first place, and that is a misguided religious hatred. If we fail to address that and to win the battle of ideas, then we will be destined to fight this battle over and over again.

Mr. Speaker, I think one of the things that gives me great hope along those lines is the recent visit that I was privileged to have in Iraq, privileged. I met with the Iraqi Governing Council. One of my great concerns has been the kind of constitution that Iraq would finally end up with.

You say, well, you know, isn't that just the new Iraqi government's job to do that?

Mr. Speaker, it is important that the new Iraqi government maintains the oversight of their constitution and builds the government for themselves. But I really, truly believe that America has a tremendous responsibility to help the newly freed, the newly liberated Nation of Iraq, have the advantage of some of our experience.

It was not so long ago that young men in airplanes, with a misguided religious fervor once again, flew their airplanes into ships, and sometimes I wonder if we missed the connection there, that the same misguided young men today are flying airplanes into buildings, and for some of the same basic, twisted reasons.

When we fought with Japan, when we prevailed, we told Japan that they should write their own constitution, and they did. They wrote three of them. None of them had religious freedom or any truly basic bill of rights in their constitution. So we recognized the importance of that, and at that time we literally imposed that constitution.

We did not have to do that this time, Mr. Speaker. Now we have been privileged to see an interim constitution in Iraq that has almost all of the magnificent bill of rights that the U.S. Constitution has.

Let me just quote Alexander Hamilton to underscore the importance of that. He said, "If it be asked what is the most sacred duty and the greatest source of our security in a republic, the answer would be an inviolable respect for the Constitution and the laws, the first growing out of the last. A sacred respect for the constitutional law is a vital principle, the sustaining energy of a free government."

Mr. Speaker, I have to say, I have been terribly concerned that somehow once we liberated Iraq and withdrew, as we always do, we do not continue to occupy a nation after we liberate it. I think it has been said that the only piece of ground that the American soldier has ever occupied for any length of time has been that little green patch of grass under some Star of David or Cross of Calvary out on some foreign battlefield cemetery.

Mr. Speaker, I pray that when we finally step away from Iraq that they will have the kind of constitutional foundation that will give them some of the same magnificent tools and hopes and dreams that America has had, because I think it would be very arrogant on the part of Americans to think we are smarter than everyone else. We have had a wonderful blessing of a

foundational Constitution that gave us a pillar to build a republic upon, and it has absolutely astounded the world in the 225-plus years that we have been here.

Mr. Speaker, I just hope with all of my heart that the Iraqi people and the Iraqi constitution that they now have remains in place, and I have some hope for that, because as I met with some of the Iraqi National Council they seemed to have caught the fever of freedom. It is like the quote from Leonardo da Vinci. He says, "Once you have tasted flight, you shall thereafter walk the Earth with your face turned skyward, for there you have been and there you long to return."

I truly believe that now the Iraqi people have tasted freedom they will hold on to this constitution.

I am reminded of the quote from Daniel Webster in our own country about our own Constitution, and I think it bears repeating tonight. He said, "Hold on, my friends, to the Constitution and to the republic for which it stands, for miracles do not cluster, and what has happened once in 6,000 years may never happen again. So hold on to the Constitution, for if the American Constitution should fall, there will be anarchy throughout the world."

Mr. Speaker, indeed, the American Constitution was a miracle, and it brought forth the greatest country in the history of humanity, and I am just hopeful enough to believe that there is going to be a new miracle in the Middle East, and somehow the constitution that is now in place in Iraq will be something that will germinate in the hearts of new Iraqi leaders as they take over, and we will some day look back on this situation and realize that with all of the critiques and all of the things that come against our President now, that we faced those critiques before. Ronald Reagan certainly faced them, and yet now we see him as one of the greatest heroes in human modernity. So I am hopeful this freedom and miracle will repeat itself.

Now I am just honored, Mr. Speaker, to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), who I truly believe to be one of the greatest Americans in this body.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I think if he thinks I am one of the greatest Americans he may be in trouble. But I want to commend the gentleman for his great service on the Committee on Armed Services and all the work he has done on behalf of people in uniform everywhere.

It is interesting. This is an interesting time in that we have had several weeks of remembering a great President, Ronald Reagan, and at the same time the criticism of our present President, George Bush, has mounted severely.

I was looking over some anti-President quotes, anti-Republican President quotes, and I thought I was reading

some things about President Bush, because, of course, you have these various groups that have been put together, knit together, to come forth in the nature of Henny Penny announce to us that the ski is falling in, particularly with respect to foreign policy, and that we have got to get this guy out of here; and we look at the credentials of the people who have said it, and a few of them have marginally worked in Republican administrations, but most of them came right out of the team on the other side.

It was interesting, I was looking at some statements about a President, and I had a couple of statements I thought bore repeating, because they looked to me like they had been applied to President Bush by his critics.

Here is a quote by a gentleman who is running for President. He said, "The biggest defense buildup since World War II has not given us a better defense. Americans feel more threatened by the prospect of war, not less so, and our national priorities have become more and more distorted as the share of our country's resources devoted to human needs diminishes."

I thought that was JOHN KERRY talking about George Bush, but it is not. It is JOHN KERRY talking about Ronald Reagan. In fact, it looks to me like they simply xeroxed this statement and put this out on the latest "sky is falling in" report about the present President.

Here is another quote: "The administration has no rational plan for our military." You heard that one before? There is no plan. "Instead, it acts on misinformed assumptions about the strength of the enemy and a presumed window of vulnerability, which we now know not to exist."

I thought, well, doggone it, that is Senator KERRY and he is talking again about George Bush. No, that is Senator KERRY talking about Ronald Reagan back in the 1980s. Of course, the same Senator KERRY now thinks that Ronald Reagan was actually quite a guy, and he said over the last several weeks that he brought us together and was a great President.

Now, here is another one. This one is a little bit personal. "You roll out the President one time a day, one exposure to all you media, no big in-depth inquiries, put him in his brown jacket and his blue jeans, put him on a ranch, let him cock his head, give you a smile, it looks like America is okay."

I thought, there is JOHN KERRY talking about George Bush down on the ranch in Texas. No, it is JOHN KERRY talking about Ronald Reagan down on the ranch in California 20 years ago.

"The President certainly was never in combat. He may have believed he was," this is another quote, "but he never was. The fact is he sent Americans off to die."

I thought maybe that was JOHN KERRY talking about George Bush. We have heard a lot about that issue over the last 3 or 4 months. No, that was

JOHN KERRY talking about Ronald Reagan.

Here is another quote: "I am proud that I stood against the President, not with him, when his intelligence agencies were abusing the Constitution of the United States and when he was running an illegal war."

Once again, I thought this was JOHN KERRY talking about President Bush. It is not. Twenty years ago, this was JOHN KERRY talking about Ronald Reagan.

After his first major political battle in the Senate over the President's foreign policy, JOHN KERRY said, "I think it was a silly and rather immature approach."

I thought, well, doggone it, that has to be JOHN KERRY talking about George Bush's approach to Iraq. No, that is not. That is JOHN KERRY talking about Ronald Reagan's approach to our Central American countries during the contra wars, 20 years ago.

Incidentally, it is interesting, that "silly and immature approach" that Senator KERRY talked about 20 years ago ended up and resulted in Guatemala, Honduras, Salvador and Nicaragua all today being fragile democracies; and, interestingly, Salvadorans are standing side-by-side with Americans fighting for freedom in Iraq today. They are some of our best soldiers. In fact, their people have shown absolute bravery on the battlefield. And one time they were on the verge of being assimilated or taken over by a communist-backed insurgency, a Russian backed insurgency back in the 1980s.

It is interesting, what JOHN KERRY called "a silly and immature approach" resulted in fragile democracies coming around or springing up in all those countries, which, before the Reagan administration had been military dictatorships.

Now, here is another one. Mr. KERRY spoke at great length about the President's abuse of the Constitution and totalitarian inclinations. This must be him talking about the PATRIOT Act. "They are literally willing to put the Constitution at risk because they believe there is somehow a higher order of things," maybe that is about Abu Ghraib, "and the ends do in fact justify the means. That is the most Marxist, totalitarian doctrine I have ever heard in my life." This is a quote from JOHN KERRY. "You have done the very thing that James Madison and others feared when they were struggling to put the Constitution together, which was to create an unaccountable system with runaway power running off against the will of the American people."

Once again, I thought that must be Mr. KERRY talking about George Bush. No, that was Mr. KERRY talking about Ronald Reagan, whom he now reveres.

Interestingly, just a year or so ago, he likened his own criticism of Ronald Reagan to George Bush. He said this, and this is about the President. He says, "They have managed him the same way they managed Ronald

Reagan. They send him out to the press for one event a day. They put him in a brown jacket and jeans and get him to move some hay and drive a truck, and all of a sudden he is the Marlboro Man."

He goes on. "We have seen governors come to Washington, and they don't have the experience in foreign policy and they get in trouble pretty quick. Look at Ronald Reagan, look at Jimmy Carter, and now, obviously, George Bush."

So let me see. We had the former leaders of the free world talking about Ronald Reagan the other day, Brian Mulroney, Maggie Thatcher, talking about the hundreds of millions of people who were freed by the Reagan doctrine of peace through strength. Those days when Ronald Reagan strode out, took leadership of the free world, and when the Russians ringed Western Europe with SS-20 missiles in an attempt to intimidate our allies, the President started to move ground-launched Cruise missiles and Pershing missiles into place in Europe, and the Russians picked up the phone and said, can we talk?

But, of course, before they picked up the phone and said can we talk, there were massive demonstrations in Europe, and liberals like Mr. KERRY talked about the idea that somehow we had lost our leadership of the free world. They called Ronald Reagan a cowboy. They said we need to talk more. We need to get concessions from the Soviet Union.

And what happened? He met their strength with American strength, and in the end we had arms reductions, and in the end Ronald Reagan negotiated not just arms limitations, he negotiated the surrender and the disassembly of the Soviet empire.

□ 1930

Very interesting that we have got now this same collection of people coming together and saying, well, they may have gotten it wrong with Ronald Reagan 20 years ago; but by golly, this time they think they have got it right with George Bush. And you can Xerox these quotes from Mr. KERRY that he used 20 years ago against President Reagan and put them in his speeches today against George Bush, President Bush; and there is not a bit of difference.

Now let us go back to the facts. The facts are that when this country was attacked, this President did what we all needed him to do. He moved aggressively against terrorists; and in moving aggressively, we hunted these guys down in places where they never thought we could get to them. The Tenth Mountain Division soldiers killed them in rifle pits at 10,000 feet elevation in the mountains of Afghanistan, in those rugged areas on the Pakistani border.

We went into Iraq and took out a dictator, who I guess, except for Adolph Hitler, was the only dictator in the his-

tory of the world who used poison gas to kill his own people. And those thousands of Kurdish mothers laying on those hillside holding their little babies killed in mid-stride by that poison gas, according to today's liberals, was not enough of a justification for the United States to change the leadership of Iraq.

What have we done in Iraq? Well, we have occupied Iraq, and it truly is an occupation and occupations are tough. They are tough on both the occupied country, and they are also tough on the occupying country. And if you do not think that is so, look at what happened after World War II when we were occupying Germany and other parts of Europe, and you had the presence of outsiders, Americans are great people, but outsiders wearing very thin on the German populace, just as we wore thin on dozens of countries simply because we were there, we were outsiders; they knew we were going to leave after a while.

We had lots of writings, lots of editorials talking about how the people who had come in and had their tanks strewn with flowers when they liberated those areas now becoming somewhat of a guest who had been there, who had overstayed their invitation and should move out.

Well, we all know that, and we all know that the stray artillery round that accidentally hit civilians, the truck that is going too fast that hurts livestock, the very presence of having outsiders in your country is always wearing thin. But what is the alternative? The alternative was Saddam Hussein and those thousands of Kurdish mothers laying on the hillside killed by poison gas in mid-stride. And I would just say to my friend, those pictures, and I keep them in my office and I look at them on a regular basis, those pictures are as compelling as anything that ever happened at Auschwitz. They are compelling, compelling pictures.

So maybe that question the school kids ask, they ask their daddies, "Daddy, if Hitler hadn't threatened the rest of us, would we have stopped him from killing the Jewish community?" Well, that is a pretty profound question. That is a pretty tough question, because generally speaking, the desire or the will to go to war manifested in a declaration of war by an assembled Congress and the President is usually justified based on the threat that a particular adversary has toward you, toward your country.

But I can tell you this, that at least partially the reason that we went into Iraq was because of those dead Kurdish mothers strewn out across that hillside killed in mid-stride by poison gas. It was those thousands of people who were taken in buses to the killing fields where the backhoes worked all night digging the trenches, where the firing squads that kept, according to the farmers, bankers' hours. They showed up at nine o'clock. Would wait

patiently for the buses full of civilians, women, old men, children; and they would disembark from the buses and line up dutifully along their trenches, and then Saddam Hussein's gunners would walk down the line and in a very workmanlike way would put bullets in the backs of their skulls, and they would be bulldozed into the trenches and filled up.

One day the farmer said that the ammo people, the executioners, ran out of ammo, and so they just bulldozed them in anyway. They found out that kills them just as dead.

So what is that we replaced, and every American who has served in Iraq, and there are 300,000 of them, incidentally, who have served in Iraq, 16,000 bronze stars have been won. I would ask the gentleman to pull that over. We might ask that that be noticed. That is one of 127 silver stars that have been awarded in combat operations to Gunnery Sergeant Jeff Bohr, who happened to place his body between his wounded people and the adversary until he himself was killed.

And, you know, as I was looking at the stuff about the Abu Ghraib prison and the prison mess, which has dominated the media, I started to look through some of these citations of bravery, and there are tons of them. There are tons of brave, brave people who have sacrificed everything, including giving that last full measure of devotion to this cause.

And I want to say to them, what you have done, the purpose of what you have done is of value. And the real meanness of the left, of these operations, where they say, Well, we like the troops, we support the troops, we do not support what they are doing, is to devalue and take away meaning from the people that serve the cause of the American military. What they did does have value. Every single person whose boot has touched that sand of the Middle East who has served his country in an honorable way has value to this country, and Gunny Sergeant Jeff Bohr is just one of those people.

If my colleagues look through, there are literally dozens and dozens of people, hundreds of people who have done heroic acts; some 16,000 Bronze Stars have been earned in that country. Yet, I saw all this publicity about Abu Ghraib, because there is a couple of newspapers driving that story. They want that story to stay alive, to the point where The Washington Post had an article the other day and on the front page I thought, boy, they are going to try to come out with something really bad.

One of the bad things they cited was that the prisoners at Guantanamo asked for sugar in their tea. These were suspected al Qaeda, some of them, the people that ran those airplanes into our Twin Towers. These people asked for sugar in their tea, and they were told by the cruel American captors that it would be a long time before they got sugar in their tea. The Washington Post, by golly, obviously thinks

that ought to be fixed real quick. The other thing they did not get was DVDs for their religious ceremonies. So on the one hand, we have people who drive planes into buildings and kill thousands of Americans; and on the other hand, we have people who commit those acts who are treated in general so well that one of their biggest complaints is that they do not get sugar in their tea and they have only The Washington Post to fight for their rights.

Now, I looked at the number of articles that The Washington Post did, because I made the statement the other day where some people said, well, that puts you out on a limb. I said that the biggest event, military event in our history, the event upon which the freedom of our world hung in the balance, and that was D-Day, the invasion of Normandy when we were fighting the forces of Hitler, that day, that event, that operation received in The Washington Post, in those days when The Washington Post wrote a lot about our military operations, that received some 57 articles in The Washington Post. We counted them up. Now, if I have missed a couple, I want The Washington Post to set me straight and send in the other articles, and we will sure put them in our count. Fifty-seven articles The Washington Post printed about the invasion of Normandy.

Now, on the other hand, The Washington Post likes the prison story like the one they just printed about the prisoners not getting enough sugar in their tea. They have printed twice as many articles about the prison mess, about Abu Ghraib, 127 articles, and they are still going, so it is not over yet. They have printed 127 articles about the prison mess, twice as many articles as they printed about the most important day, arguably, in the history of this country during the 20th century, and that was D-Day, the invasion of Normandy, when thousands of ships and thousands of airplanes and hundreds of thousands of fighting Americans, including thousands who lost their lives, did everything they could to win back freedom for the world.

So the invasion of Normandy, D-Day, had roughly half as much importance to The Washington Post as the Abu Ghraib prison mess. I think that is imbalanced. And I think it is time for us to refocus on winning this war and, maybe more importantly, now that we have come to the first phase of this hand-off, handing off this country to a new government, a government that is led by people who are responsive to their constituents, that means to the Iraqi people, with a military that will respond to a civilian leadership; and maybe it will not be a Jeffersonian democracy, and it will not have all of the complex attributes that a country that has been free for hundreds of years has.

But, hopefully, it will be a country where the average guy has a modicum of freedom and protection, like freedom of speech, freedom to come and go, freedom to buy or sell, freedom to

know that somebody is not going to knock on your door in the middle of the night and take you on a bus to the killing fields and dig a trench and execute you and push you into it.

So, hopefully, we are going to turn this country over to a government and a military, a new military that we are standing up, which will be strong enough to back that government and be responsible to that civilian government. And the United States, which is much chastened by the rest of the world, just as Ronald Reagan was chastened by the rest of the world when he took on the Soviet Union for them, and when he freed literally hundreds of millions of people, all we are asking of the people of Iraq is this: be free. Be nice to each other. Be representative if you are in government. Be responsive to what your people want. Be good to each other. Have a rule of law. Have a court system that works. Have an education system that works. Have economic opportunities so a guy with a good idea and a machine shop can make some money. Very basic, simple things.

Arguing against that, of course, are our so-called allies who really have not been our allies in many cases. The French, for example, are not our allies. The French have, on occasion, been very strong, stood strongly with the United States. Certainly they did when our people were shedding our blood at Normandy. The French liked us then. We have Mr. Lafayette gazing at us from his framed picture here on the House floor. We sure remember him.

We remember those allies in those early days, and also in World War II and, of course, the French have contingents fighting terrorism in other areas. But the idea that the French would not agree with us to get rid of a man who left all of those Kurdish mothers killed with poison gas with their babies laying across that hillside, or gunning down people in wholesale quantities and pushing them with bulldozers into open graves, or taking people who he suspected of having done things against the State and having their arms removed from them, that prison, and having schoolchildren who wrote graffiti on the blackboard "Saddam Hussein is a bad guy" taken out, schoolchildren, and hanged from the neck until they are dead, certainly the French would agree with us that that is the kind of a government you want to change. And certainly the Russians should agree with us that that is the kind of government that you want to change.

Now, maybe they will not agree with us; maybe they do not agree with us. I am just reminded that when we hit Mr. Qadhafi in the days when Ronald Reagan was then called a cowboy by the left, hit Mr. Qadhafi in those days when Qadhafi's agents have bombed Americans in Germany, a terrorist act, and we flew a responsive aircraft, we flew our bomber aircraft out of Heathrow in England, I remember

Maggie Thatcher stood with us. And when she stood with us, even a majority of the British people were right on the bubble as to whether or not they should support us because they thought this might bring trouble on them, but Maggie Thatcher stood with us.

But when we flew over France with our bombing runs, we had to go around France, because France, even then, did not like our actions, and this particular action against a terrorist who I think they felt they could deal with, Mr. Qadhafi, so they told our planes not to cross their soil. That was not under George Bush; that was under Ronald Reagan. Do my colleagues know what Ronald Reagan did? He flew those planes right through the Gulf of Sidra and he flew a couple of cruise missiles right down to meet Mr. Qadhafi and he changed his attitude. Maybe that change of attitude is going to result in new openings in Libya.

Other actions that Mr. Qadhafi has taken lately would indicate maybe it is not. But the point is that that President stood strong against lots of criticism back here from the left and lots of criticism from allies like the French, but he did the right thing.

□ 1945

This President is doing the right thing, and we are on the verge now of making this hand-off. We are going to have elections in December. It is going to be a rough, tough, difficult road. We drove that steel column up through Baghdad very quickly and did it in what I think was a historically effective manner.

This occupation is a tough occupation. It is always tough when you have to provide a shield behind which a new government can knit itself together and that is what we are having to do. We have to provide that shield. That shield has vulnerability. When you are out there shielding people, you have vulnerability just when we have seen when they bombed U.S. headquarters; they have bombed hospitals; they have bombed lots of places where people are doing good things but we will continue to provide that shields until we make this hand-off.

I will just say one thing to the gentleman that we have learned in these United States that freedom is not free. It is also not guaranteed and freedom is not going to be guaranteed for the Iraqi people either. We are going to give them their freedom and a running start. They will have to have some grit to maintain that freedom. They have lots of enemies in the neighborhood. I hope they make it because we put an enormous investment, an investment like the gunnery sergeant who is in that particular citation.

In fact, if the gentleman will look at that, is that for the Navy Cross or the Silver Star?

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. That is a Silver Star.

Mr. HUNTER. There are lots of folks who have given a great deal, not just

for our country, but for Iraq; and it is a very, very important thing that the Iraqi people take hold and have discipline and have tenacity and have toughness and grab hold of this idea of freedom and evolve that idea, that policy, that desire into a Nation that can endure, that will have a good relationship with the United States.

I thank the gentleman for taking out this time and I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), who is just a great contributor to these discussions for letting me talk about Iraq.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the distinguished chairman. And it is very difficult, as you know, to add much to the chairman's words because he is so articulate and has such a command of the history and just the heart and passion of what it is all about. I guess I would only associate my own feelings with the way that the gentleman has pointed out the heroism of our soldiers.

As it happens, just the Iraqi conflict about 3,700 soldiers have received Purple Hearts, 4 Distinguished Service Crosses, 127 Silver Stars, and 16,000 Bronze Stars and we had 7 that did bad things in the Abu Ghraib prison.

I think it is a great reminder to those of us in the political atmosphere that it is not those of us in this body that are the ones that bought freedom, even though there are some of the veterans here, but it is those who went out on the front lines and poured their blood out on the battlefields that bought our freedom.

With that, I would like to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I also am impressed by the words of our colleague from California. His observations, his analysis, I think as always are incredibly insightful and important. I wish every single American could have heard this discussion of the history of our involvement, the political nature of the debate we are having about our involvement and exactly what is at stake. Because I do not think I have ever heard it put better and more succinctly.

The gentleman suggests that the issues that we are attempting to pursue and are involved with in our efforts in Iraq are broad and honorable and they are. His description of what it is we are trying to accomplish, the kind of government we are trying to put in place in Iraq is accurate. Also, his analysis of how difficult this is going to be is important for us to focus on for a moment. And if we do not think for a moment, if we do not think that what we are doing is right and that, in fact, the seeds of democracy that we are attempting to implant in that area of the world, a place, of course, where these seeds have never been planted before, certainly never have sprouted before, if we do not think that that is a threat to the rest of the world, the Arab world especially, the fundamentalist Islamic world, then we should only look to what is happening tonight.

As we speak here, reports are now coming through that the Iranians are massing troops, perhaps four divisions, on the border with Iraq. Their intentions we, of course, are not sure of but they are not good, we are sure of that. Whether or not they are intending to move quickly before some change of power occurs there or whether or not they intend to, in fact, take advantage of what may be a chaotic situation at the point that a change in power and authority occurs, we are not sure. But they are there for a reason.

Much of the problem we are having in Iraq, much of the destruction, much of the terrorist activity is as a result of Iranian aggression in the area. They have, as you know, supported insurgencies in Iraq. They have themselves supported both financially and morally the development of the most extreme mosques and the most extreme Imams, pushing them into Iraq and the Shia areas.

My own guess is that they are looking for an opportunity that as we approach the time that we are going to turn over the government of Iraq to the Iraqis this is a volatile and very precarious situation that exists and they are going to make it even more volatile and even more precarious. Why? What is their purpose? Again, we can only speculate right now, the three of us here, I am sure there is a great deal more information available to other people, certainly to the chairman, but we at this point in time can only assume that they are afraid that it will work, that Iran is afraid that what we are trying to do in Iraq will work and that we will, indeed, create a democratic government, the tentacles of which may spread throughout the area.

This is something that, in fact, they cannot abide. It is a threat to their existence. It is true because it is a totalitarian dictatorship that as we know now even the IAEA agrees that they are in the process of developing a nuclear weapons program. Even the Europeans are now saying, golly, there is something happening in Iran we have to be aware of and concerned of. There is no doubt that the Iranians, that the mullahs in Iran, in Tehran, are frightened by the prospects of freedom in Iraq.

Again, what should that tell us about our own efforts and about whether or not this policy is sound? There are, of course, Iranian dissidents in the United States. There are folks who have been driven out of Iran who are on the border now in Iraq. They are being protected by the United States. I know that the Iranian government has demanded many times that they be turned over to Iran, the dissidents that now form the MEK. And although now the MEK in many respects, historically speaking, we can be concerned about their actions, the fact is they are pressing for a secular government in Iran, a government that would allow freedom of religion, press, and speech. I worry

of course about their safety, the safety of the people in Iraq. I worry about our willingness, what may be our willingness to surrender them. I hope that does not occur. Because I hope they can be valuable, and I hope that as they have been valuable allies over the last several years.

They are the ones that, as a matter of fact, have given us the information, much of the information that we have, the reliable information we have about Iraq's program of nuclear weapons development. But it is important for us to realize that this fight is enormous in its scope. It is not just for the security of Iraq and the freedom of Iraq. It is for the security of the entire Middle East and for the freedom of the entire Middle East. And this is the greatest threat to fundamentalist Islam. Our existence, our way of life, what we believe to be the way in which people can exist on this planet, that is the threat that they face because they cannot co-exist with that. A totalitarian dictatorship, a theocracy of that nature cannot exist in a modern world where people are allowed to make decisions about themselves and about their creator and choose religions based upon their consciences and not forced upon them by any authority.

This is not a world in which they can live, nor will they, and they will fight and they will threaten and they will bluster. But it is an indication to me that we are in fact doing what is right in Iraq. We are creating an environment that is threatening to the rest of the fundamentalist regimes in the area. This is an honorable goal on our part, but it is worrisome to the extreme. We do not know what they will do, nor what they have to do it with.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I just thank the gentleman for his very astute analysis that there are no guarantees in this war against terrorism and this is a central part of the war against terrorism.

It is interesting that we had America hit with these aircraft taken over by terrorists, shocking Americans beyond their wildest nightmares and in a way that no one could imagine just a few years ago. I think that is going to be for this country, even Iraq aside, that is going to be the pattern for the next many, many years.

We live in a new age. The age is terrorists with high technology. And we had a Soviet Union which was big and strong and fielded literally in the Warsaw Pact hundreds of divisions. It had a lot of might. It had 309 SS-18 intercontinental ballistic missiles, each of which had 10 warheads, each of which was about 30 times as powerful as the bomb that hit Hiroshima. And they had those bombs and those missiles aimed at American cities, and they had at times over the last 20, 30 years very aggressive foreign policies. But they were fairly predictable, the Soviet Union.

We certainly should not lapse into nostalgia for the Soviet Union because

they were very much an evil empire. From where the sun now stands we will have people excavating graves, many of them mass graves that were caused by the Soviet Union, but this is a new era. This is an era of terrorists with high technology, and it is an era that will see bad people doing everything they can to leverage technology and to hurt Americans and our allies in ways that go far beyond the scope of what was possible just a few years ago. And just a usage of those American aircraft that were taken over by the terrorists and the thousands of people who were killed and hurt by those actions are representative of what we can expect for the next 20 or 30 years.

We all breathed a sigh of relief when the Soviet Union went down. We look forward to an era of peace. Unfortunately, we will only have an era of peace if we have strength, and one thing that we will have to have if that we dissembled in the days when liberals in this country thought that it was not Marquis of Queensbury rules for us to have good intelligence. We are going to have to have really good intelligence.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my very good friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), as he is leaving, because he is a gentleman who is very astute and has spent a lot of time looking in depth at these issues and knows a lot about security. He is not a member of our Committee on Armed Services, but we wish he was. And I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask my friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS), who has done a great job on this Committee on Armed Services, we put together this bill. We hope to get the other body to get to work and get their bill done and get the thing finished and get it to the President's desk. But I wanted to ask him what his impressions are of where we stand in this war against terror. Because I know he looks at it every day and I just say to the gentleman, you have done a great job on the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman so much. Ironically, I suppose it does not surprise the chairman that one of his junior members would be largely in agreement with him related to the circumstances that we face in this world.

I think that the terrorist circumstances today are just what the gentleman said. We have the melding of being 60 years in the nuclear age with this mindless terrorist element that has no regard for human life, their own or others, and I think that is a recipe of the gravest concern for the United States.

I am perhaps more concerned than anything else about a nation like North Korea selling some type of nuclear weapon or weaponized anthrax or other weapons of mass destruction to al Qaeda. And I think that even under-

scores further the importance of our presence in Iraq because in so doing, we are keeping the terrorist organizations occupied and, indeed, defeating them in the battlefields and breaking up that network.

□ 2000

Sometimes terrorists, it is a terrible way to analogize it, but teenagers, if there is just one of them, do not get in a lot of trouble, but when they get together, they figure out ways to really get in trouble. I feel like that it is critically important for us to continue to break up the organizational mechanism.

Mr. HUNTER. That is one thing this President has done in moving so aggressively because lots of people cautioned him to hold back and wait and delay; and by moving aggressively, he kept the terrorists off balance. Many people have said, well, how come we have not had more strikes and have not had more actions against Americans. Very simply, when you have a meeting and a bomb-guided precision munition comes through the window and blows up your meeting, it is pretty tough to conspire to kill Americans, and the literally hundreds and hundreds of bad guys have discovered that the Americans were able to find them in places where they thought they were totally inviolate.

That is because of the aggressive posture against terrorism that this President assumed. He did the right thing by doing that.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I think the chairman is exactly accurate. The idea that a good defense is a good offense is certainly not a new concept, but in this case it is extremely appropriate; and as you say, when terrorists are meeting in a tent and a bomb flies in, that can be a real distraction. It can really break up their approach, and I just think it says a great deal for this President in understanding the mindset of terrorists.

The terrorists here are not going to be redeemed, and they are not going to turn over a new leaf or we are not going to be able to negotiate with them. We have to defeat them in the purest terms for the sake of the innocent people both in this country and other parts of the world, and I think the chairman is exactly right.

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I say one other thing to my good colleague. I think I got the name wrong on Gunny Sergeant Jeffrey Bohr. I called him Jeffrey Shore. That shows how good my eyes are after being here for 20 years or so. I just ask the gentleman, since we have got Gunny Sergeant Bohr's citation up there and since the doggone media has literally, with the 127 articles coming out of one newspaper alone about the prison mess involving criminal acts by what so far have been focused, been identified as seven people who have been recommended to be bound over under arti-

cle 32 of UCMJ for courts-martial, with all that mess occurring and being so focused on by the media, that brave people like those people who are out there fighting in the field for our freedom are not being recognized. This gentleman did not get on the front pages of any newspaper. It was more important to talk about a detainee not getting sugar in his tea; but if the gentleman could read that citation, I think as long as we put him up there, we better get it right. I would ask the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) to help me out on this one. If you could read that citation, I think that would be appreciated, hopefully, by the gentleman's family.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I would be honored to do so. This is on the letterhead of the Secretary of the Navy in Washington, D.C., and it starts:

"The President of the United States takes pride in presenting the Silver Star posthumously to Gunnery Sergeant Jeffrey E. Bohr, Jr., United States Marine Corps, for service as set forth in the following.

"CITATION:

"For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action against the enemy while serving as Company Gunnery Sergeant, Company A, 1st Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment, Regimental Combat Team 5, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom on 10 April 2003. With his company assigned the dangerous mission of seizing a presidential palace in Baghdad and concerned that logistical resupply might be slow in reaching his comrades once they reached the objective, Gunnery Sergeant Bohr selflessly volunteered to move in his two soft skinned vehicles with the company's main armored convoy. While moving through narrow streets toward the objective, the convoy took intense small arms and rocket-propelled grenade fire. Throughout this movement, Gunnery Sergeant Bohr delivered accurate, effective fires on the enemy while encouraging his Marines and supplying critical information to his company commander. When the lead vehicles of the convoy reached a dead end and were subjected to enemy fire, Gunnery Sergeant Bohr continued to boldly engage the enemy while calmly maneuvering his Marines to safety. Upon learning of a wounded Marine in a forward vehicle, Gunnery Sergeant Bohr immediately coordinated medical treatment and evacuation. Moving to the position of the injured Marine, Gunnery Sergeant Bohr continued to lay down a high volume of suppressive fire, while simultaneously guiding the medical evacuation vehicle, until he was mortally wounded by enemy fire. By his bold leadership, wise judgment, and complete dedication to duty, Gunnery Sergeant Bohr reflected great credit upon himself and upheld the highest traditions of the Marine Corps and the United States Naval Service.

"For the President, the Secretary of the Navy."

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for reading that citation and so we have laid out for Gunny Sergeant Bohr's family at least publication of his service to our country and to our flag that will never make the front page of *The Washington Post* because unless he denies sugar for the tea of detainees at Guantanamo, he will not merit that kind of attention; but we have literally, again, 16,000 Bronze Stars were earned, and all those are not earned for valor. All Silver Stars are earned for valor.

We have got a picture, and I would ask the gentleman if he could hold that picture up. That is the picture of a GI giving some stuff to some kids. That is the story of the American GI. The Marines right now, they went up and got in battle at Fallujah, but you know what they brought to Fallujah? They brought soccer balls to Fallujah because they wanted to help people and to be good and American GIs are good to people.

I am reminded in the days when the liberals were talking about how Vietnam hated us and just wanted us out and if we would just get out of there, by golly, the Viet Cong and the MVA could create a people's paradise. When the GIs left Vietnam, about half that country tried to swim after us; and for years after that, they would get out and push off in a leaky shrimp boat into the South China Sea, some of them to be capsized and drowned, a few of them to make refugee camps like the one in Hong Kong.

I am kind of reminded of Senator KERRY, meeting in Paris with the North Vietnamese leaders must have felt strongly they were on the right side of this thing. I am reminded that when those people pushed off in those leaky shrimp boats and got to Hong Kong and later were forcibly repatriated to what was described as the People's Paradise of Communist Vietnam, if you look at the photographs of those refugees being taken back to so-called people's paradise, you will notice that many of them were shrieking and crying and holding on to the chain link of the detaining facility. They had to be sedated and forcibly removed from that squalid refugee camp because that squalid refugee camp in Hong Kong meant one thing to them that they would never see in Vietnam. It meant freedom, and that is the real story of the American presence in Vietnam.

It is also the story of the American presence in Tokyo. After World War II, we had the capability of doing anything we wanted to the Japanese people, and the warlords of Japan told their people to expect us to be as bad to them as they had been to the rest of the world, when they raped and killed over 100,000 people in Manking, China; when they beheaded many of our American captives; killed a third of our POWs. Yet American GIs walked down the streets of Tokyo and handed out Hershey bars to the kids, and there were almost no incidents of mistreatment of civilians by Americans.

Once again, if you take that drop in the bucket, that one group of people that did wrong at Abu Ghraib and match them against the 300,000 GIs who did right, it should not dominate 127 articles out of one paper alone. So I thank my friend for letting me ramble on here. I think we have had a good discussion. I would like to hear his closing thoughts.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I just would be grateful to listen to your rambling at anytime. I think you so poignantly expressed the nobility of the American soldier. They are the most noble fighting force in the world. There is a verse that says, Greater love hath no man than this, than man lay down his life for his friends, and I am certain of what the American soldier has done.

I find it kind of interesting as a closing thought that one of the members of the Iraq Governing Council and leader of Iraq's Assyrian Democratic Movement that visited here, his name is Younadem Kana, and he came to America and these were his words about our American soldiers in a sense. They are really to all of us.

He said: "We are calling on America not to stop; to go on with us on this blessed mission, which the Iraqi people will never forget: this blessed mission of liberation, of democracy, and of freedom."

"The Iraqi people are free now," Kana proclaims. "For first time in the history of Iraq, for the first time in 14 centuries, our neighbors, and the majority of people today, recognize us and acknowledge us. We are all together on the Governing Council, and the cabinet; our rights are guaranteed under the fundamental law."

"We appreciate the losses of the United States of those 700 victims, martyrs we call them, who shed their blood on Iraqi soil. But compare the losses in 1 year of fighting terrorism to the roughly 3,000 people terrorism killed in America in 2 minutes. Think of the \$84 billion lost in those 2 minutes, and compare that to the financial cost in Iraq. You have to make these comparisons, and then choose whether to fight the terrorists in the Middle East and keep yourselves safe, or to fight terrorism here, in your own home."

Then he says, "I am at risk all of the time. But this is the price of freedom."

Our soldiers have certainly taught us the price of freedom.

DEFENDING THE HOMELAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, we have, I think, had an incredibly interesting hour preceding this and discussion of our efforts in Iraq and indeed around the world in the fight against terror.

I want to talk a little tonight about our efforts to defend the homeland, essentially. Our efforts to deal with the fact that we recognize all the things that we have said up to this point in time, the last hour at least, have been rather ominous. They have been frightening in many ways because they lay out a situation for us that we cannot ignore, and that is this, that our enemies are willing; that they will go to any length to try and bring us down; that they are driven by a theocratic and ideological motivation that knows no bounds. They are fanatical.

Unfortunately, every single day in the paper we see the fact that somebody has decided to commit another act of terrorism, blow themselves up or set off a bomb along the side of the road and kill Americans and kill Westerners and kill members of the coalition forces; and we recognize, as I say, that these people are fanatics. They are driven with a passion that knows no bounds. They will do anything necessary to advance their cause, anything.

That includes, of course, bringing the war here to our shores. We have seen it happen. We also know that it is not just a possibility, that it will happen again. It is a probability. So we have been talking in more grandiose terms for the last hour about how to fight the war on terror.

□ 2015

I must tell you that I sort of reject or am concerned about the use of the word "terror" to describe the enemy, because it is an amorphous term. It does not really and truly let people understand exactly what it is and who it is we are up against. I believe that this is a war against fundamentalist Islam. It has been going on for a long time. It has gotten hot and cold. It has been fought in various places around the world and never been really very much at the top of our list of concerns because the oceans have separated us. This war has gone on, East against West, if you will, certainly fundamentalist Islam against Judeo-Christianity for now centuries. This is the latest iteration but it is much more dangerous than any other stage of this conflict because, of course, today's technology provides those folks with an ability to strike us regardless of the fact that we have oceans separating us.

They do so by coming into our country. They come across undefended borders, both northern and southern borders of the United States. They come into Canada where their policy of immigration is so liberal, especially their policy toward people who claim to be refugees, is so liberal that I have only slightly jokingly said that Osama bin Laden could land in Toronto after having cut off his beard, call himself Omar the tentmaker and claim to be a refugee and the Canadian government would immediately allow him entrance into Canada and, by the way, give him \$150 for his trouble and tell him to